



#12/13 P13  
3/22/03

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re patent application of

Shuya Ogi

Serial No.: 09/964,735

Group Art Unit: 2873

Filed: September 28, 2001

Examiner: Stultz, Jessica T.

For: ROD LENS ARRAY AND PROCESS FOR PRODUCING THE SAME

Box Non-Fee Amendment  
Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

RECEIVED  
MAR 19 2003  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

PETITION FOR A ONE MONTH EXTENSION OF TIME,  
RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT, AND AMENDMENT

Sir:

In response to the restriction requirement mailed January 23, 2003, the applicant hereby petitions for a one-month extension of time to respond. A check in the amount of \$110 is attached to satisfy the petition fee. If any additional fees are required to grant this petition, the Commissioner is authorized to charge attorney's deposit account 50-2041 (Whitham, Curtis & Christofferson, P.C.).

The applicant elects the Group III invention with partial traverse.

As discussed with the Examiner by telephone call on March 10, 2003, the amendment filed November 6, 2002 has not been entered in the case. The Examiner indicated that the amendment was not recorded in her file, and has requested a copy of the amendment to accompany this response. Attached hereto is a copy of the November 6, 2002 amendment together with a copy of a date stamped receipt showing filing in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on November 6, 2002. As was discussed on March 10, 2003, claims 31, 32, and 35 respectively depend from claims 26, 27 and 34, and each claim is directed to a rod lens array. Claim 33 depends from claim 31. In view of this, claims 31-33 and 35 clearly should be in Group III and should be considered by the Examiner.

In addition, pursuant to the discussions with the Examiner of March 10, 2003, claim 25 has been amended below to be directed to a "rod lens array". As such, claim 25 should now be grouped in Group III, and claim 25 should be